The A. F. of L. Weekly News Service gives a brief summary of important matters affecting labor, occurring in the industrial, legislative and judicial fields, and such other information that will benefit the trade union movement.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

WEEKLY NEWS SERVICE

Entered as second-class matter September 80, 1912, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized July 11, 1918.

Steam is no stronger than it was 100 years ago, but it is put to better use.—Emerson.

VOL. 16, NO. 47. WASHINGTON, D. C., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1927. WHOLE NO. 826.

BOLSHEYS HAVE NO PLACE IN TRADE UNIONS

A "free speech" plea to the United Mine Workers' convention failed to stay the tidal wave of Communist opposition.

The miners were not fooled by the sob stuff of cornered foes. Henceforth the door of that union is barred to the Bolsheys.

The Communist has no place in the trade union. He secures entrance by false pretenses, as the sneak thief enters a private house.

Progress by the unions is based on the collective capacity of their members. These workers secure social, economic and political changes just in proportion to their unity, education and discipline.

This system is the foundation of democratic institutions. The workers advance as rapidly as their unions grow in membership and their collective capacity develops. This is why unionists put organization first in their list of essentials.

The trade unionist is an opportunist. He is a "step-at-a-timer." He knows the bright days unionism has brought into his life, and he knows the hard work that is necessary before social changes are accepted.

He has no patience with those who tell him progress can be made with seven-league boots.

The Bolshey is a revolutionist. He is out to smash every institution and ideal. The unions he would destroy by using them for his purpose. Like the sneak thief, he will make fair promises to gain an entrance into these organizations, but the purpose of both is illicit.

The Bolshey despises the trade union, its philosophy and its methods. It is unto counter to his revolutionary plan, but he is too cunning to openly boast of this opposition.

He dilutes his poison, and when discovered and expelled, he whimpers "free speech is denied."

The Bolshey also pleads that if he is thrown out "all minority groups in the unions should be expelled."

There is no comparison between a group that would make trade unions a pawn for revolution and a minority of organized labor that is working along trade union lines.

Minority parties are found in every movement and in every institution. This element often serves a useful purpose by arousing the majority to greater activity and holding it to its original purpose.

Bolsheys can not be considered a minority group in the unions. They have no sympathy with the unions. Their one purpose is to change the union to a revolutionary group; to inculcate a revolutionary spirit in those who are committed to the slow process of orderly changes through education and organization.

They would have the unions a nucleus for mob fighting and class hates. To conceal his wrecking policy, the Bolshey talks of "free speech," and expresses pious well wishes for the trade unions.

Those who talk of a community of interest between unionists and Bolsheys are either tricky or irresponsible.

SHORTER WORK WEEK FAR FROM UNIVERSAL

Washington, Feb. 5.—In a review of wages and hours in foundries and machine shops in 1925, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics shatters the belief that the eight-hour day is in general effect.

Average full-time hours per week for males in foundries of the United States as a whole were 52.4 in 1925 and 51.5 in 1925, and in machine shops 50.8 in 1923 and 50.4 in 1925.

Average full-time hours in foundries in 1925 range from 47.1 per week in Oregon to 56.1 in Georgia, and in machine shops from 49.4 in California to 54.5 in Kansas. The industry average for all the States combined is 51.5 hours per week for foundries and 50.4 per week for machine shops.

Average full-time earnings per week for males ranged from $23.07 for laborers to $36.35 for toolmakers in 1925.

"A large number of the plants covered in this study did not pay any extra time for overtime," the report states.

"Of the 413 foundries covered, 156 paid no additional rate for overtime work, 126 paid time and one-half for all overtime, 65 paid time and one-half for overtime on days and double time for Sunday and holidays and 35 paid time and one-half for overtime on week days until midnight and double time after midnight, and all work on Sundays and holidays.

"A higher percentage of machine shops allowed additional rates for overtime than foundries, as only 116 of the 511 covered reported no extra time for overtime."

WANT STATE CONTROL OF STOCK EXCHANGE

Albany, N. Y., Feb. 5.—Incorporation of the New York Stock Exchange and a sale of $1,000 a year on each seat on the exchange is favored by Assemblyman Cuvillier of New York City. Every attempt to control the Stock Exchange under some sort of legal control, as is the rule with banks, trust companies and bond and mortgage companies, has failed.

"The exchange is practically a secret financial club depending upon the word of honor of all its members in business deals," Mr. Culliver said. "The exchange fixes a standard value on all stocks and bonds listed, which is accepted as the true value.

"The Stock Exchange has the benefit of the law in call loans which permits it to borrow money at an interest which other financial houses can not command. The exchange should either be incorporated or it should be licensed to do business in this State, and in either case it should be under the State Banking Department."

BASIC EIGHT-HOUR DAY IS URGED BY RATHBONE

Washington, Feb. 5.—The Government should declare for the basic eight-hour day, said Congressman Rathbone of Illinois at a committee hearing on his bill that will improve working conditions for employes in the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture. The bill provides for time and one-half over eight hours.

"This principle involved in this bill is important," said Congressman Rathbone. "The government should lead in social moves. That the long work day has no place in the economic life of America."

MILL AGENT AIDS UNION

Woonsocket, R. I., Feb. 5.—General Agent Hall of the Manville-Jenckes Company has proven a better trade union organizer than a mill agent. He came here more than 14 months ago, and immediately started a movement to increase the work week from 54 to 48 hours. The union secured 1,700 new members during that period, and Mr. Hall is out of a job.

REJECT CONVICT LABOR PLAN

Nashville, Tenn., Feb. 5.—The House of Representatives indefinitely postponed a petition to Congress to vote against the Cooper bill. This legislation would permit convict labor commodities made in one State to be subject to the laws of the State in which they are sold.

The Cooper bill is opposed by convict labor exploiters. The proposed petition to Tennessee members of Congress to vote against the bill was urged by Lewis S. Pope, commissioner of institutions.

GOUGERS FLEECE COAL INDUSTRY; EVILS HAVE NOT BEEN CORRECTED

New York, Feb. 5.—Good times are over for bituminous coal gougers and the fundamental weakness of this industry has not been removed, according to a survey by the New York Trust Company.

The gougers thrive on low wages, and blame the United Mine Workers for their troubles. Referring to the artificial influence of the British strike on the soft coal industry in America, the trust company says:

"There seemed to be little reason for believing that this stimulus is more than temporary. Over-production, wasteful methods of extraction, operation and unprofitable mines—these have been solved by a temporary stimulus to consumption. As the Jacksonville agreement expires, some kind of conference between miners and mine owners must be arranged to consider not only wages but all the questions fundamental to the industry's prosperity. There is plenty of coal, there are plenty of mine workers, there is a known and reliable market. All that is needed is an intelligent direction by the industry itself."

Indianapolis, Feb. 5.—Mismanagement by coal operators and discriminatory freight rates is responsible for present conditions in the bituminous coal industry, officers of the United Mine Workers declared at the convention of these workers.

President Lewis said excessive over-development, intermittent and seasonal operation, recurrent unemployment and competitive warfare are the major causes.

Vice President Murray said that "an abrogation of wage contracts by cheating operators and inexperienced management have contributed to a period of cutthroat competition that is dissipating large profits and is fast wrecking the basic structure of the bituminous coal industry."

ACCUSED OFFICIAL BULL-PENNED MINERS

Charleston, W. Va., Feb. 5.—The House of Delegates unanimously voted to impeach Gov. C. Bond, when the bills, posed as State auditor by Governor Gore for official misconduct, incompetence, neglect of duty, corruption in office and forgery.

He was indicted by a grand jury, but disappeared. Later he returned and was cheered as a conquering hero by anti-union forces. The political agents who would discredit the Governor's fight for political cleanliness.

Bond was in command in the State militia in 1912-13 when miners struck in the Cabin Creek and Paint Creek fields. He was active in establishing martial law and filling bull pens with strikers. The civil courts were set aside and free speech, assemblage and press denied. The reign of terror continued until the Federal Government unhorsed these Bolshevists.

"The most of Bond's corrupt acts in office occurred during the Morgan administration," the West Virginia Federationist said. "This was the most antagonistic administration to organized labor in the history of West Virginia. State officials, State police and State money were used to wreck the miners' union in southern West Virginia. It has been charged that some of the officials, in league with anti-union operators and police and gun agents, inspired the so-called armed march of miners in 1921."

WOULD CONTROL TAXES OF ISLAND CITIZENS

Washington, Feb. 5.—Senator Bingham has introduced a bill that would restrict the power of the Porto Rican legislature to pass appropriation bills. Under the Porto Rican organic act, passed by the United States Congress, the island legislature may make appropriations for the welfare of the people, providing that such money is secured by taxation. The Bingham bill would benefit the sugar and other large interests by taking this tax power from Porto Ricans.

"The Bingham bill is reactionary," said Santiago Iglesias, secretary of the Pan-American Federation of Labor.

"The proposal has been denounced by the people of Porto Rico who are exploited by big business. Another obnoxious provision is to empower the governor of the island, who is appointed by the President of the United States, to select members of the Public Service Commission who are now elected by the people."

CHILDREN ARE UNDERFED

New York, Feb. 5.—Between 250,000 and 300,000 school children in this city are suffering from malnutrition, according to Health Commissioner Harris. He said he could not give the statistics which such a statement implies, but that his experience as a physician and health conditions convinced him that these conditions exist.

CHAIN GANG IS CRIME BREEDER

Raleigh, N. C., Feb. 5.—The chain gang has no place in a Christian civilization, Col. T. L. Kirkpatrick told delegates to a fraternal convention here.

"This system is a relic of barbarism. It is hopelessly unsconomic, inhuman and antiquated," he said.

"Service in the chain gang does not reform criminals. It is a hatchery for increased crime. It gives the younger victims of its necessarily brutal principles the only urge needed to make them the lasting enemies of society."

PEONAGE IS PRAISED IN "FORCED" LETTERS

Washington, Feb. 5.—President Green is informed by the Industrial Commission of Arizona that Porto Ricans who were lured to the cotton fields of that State by offers of high terms to Porto Rico of working conditions in Arizona. The letters, which are declared "forced" and "misleading," are published in Porto Rico.

"Many of these Porto Ricans have said that one must pick and sack more than 70 pounds of cotton per day," the commission's industrial agent writes. "After transportation charges are deducted there is not enough left to support a family, especially since many children continue to be sick and need medical attention.

"Another source of distress is that cotton growers do not employ Porto Ricans whose wives and children are not able to pick cotton. An impartial investigation has been requested by many of the Porto Ricans through me, and I feel that steps should be taken to secure this investigation immediately and the Cotton Growers' Association be compelled to send back those who wish to go."

UNION DRIVE PLANNED IN NORTHWEST LABOR

Minneapolis, Feb. 5.—Organized labor is planning for a city-wide organizing campaign that will be directed by the Central Labor Union.

"We must stiffen and lead the resistance of workers against employers who would lower our living standards," the union says.

"The purchasing power of Minneapolis workers should be organized to support the trade union movement. This can be done by a more intensive campaign for the union label."

NIGHT WORK DANGEROUS

San Francisco, Feb. 5.—Because of the hazardous nature of their employment, organized electrical workers ask city officials to prohibit night work by these municipal employes. Even though double pay is offered, dangers through open manholes and high voltage wires do not compensate for the risk.

FAVOR STATE FUND FOR COMPENSATION

Albany, N. Y., Feb. 5.—A joint bill providing for a State monopoly of workmen's compensation by the creation of a State fund, has been introduced by Senator Downing and Assemblyman Hackenberg. The measure is supported by Governor Smith and the New York State Federation of Labor. Similar bills introduced at other sessions of the General Assembly have been defeated.

The bill provides that private insurance companies shall be eliminated from the field of industrial casualty insurance. Representatives of organized labor maintain the method is successful in Ohio where private concerns have been driven out of the State.

"Our bill represents one of the most fundamental and perhaps the most important demands of organized labor," said a joint statement by the introducers. "If compensation is to be effective as a special agency, it must necessarily become bad as a business. Private insurance companies thwart its development for business reasons, and the result is that we miss the real purpose of workmen's compensation. A State monopoly will make it a social agency. At present it is a competitive business run for a desire for profits."

FEDERAL EMPLOYES WORK 7-DAY WEEK

Washington, Feb. 5.—The Federal Government has thousands of employes on the seven-day basis, said Luther C. Steward, president of the National Federation of Federal Employes, at a hearing on the Oldfield bill (H. R. 12317).

The act would set eight hours and six days as the minimum work week for Government custodial employes. Mr. Steward urged that the legislation be extended to all Federal employes.

"This legislation would establish a work week of not more than six days, except in an emergency," said Congressman Oldfield. "This is essential, and under the unfavorable working conditions of certain employes, it demands affirmative action by this Congress."

SEAMEN'S LAW ANNULLED CLASS LEGISLATION

Washington, Feb. 5.—The La Follette seamen's law is not "class legislation"; it repealed the imprisonment feature of the master and servant law as applied to seamen 50 years after it had been applied to everybody else, said Andrew Furuseth, president of the International Seamen's Union, writing to the Wall Street Journal.

That newspaper recently declared in a leading editorial: "Only politics, as represented in class legislation, like the La Follette seamen's law, will long keep unionism alive." In his letter, the trade unionist called attention to the leading provisions of the seamen's law.

"Under treaties between the United States and some 30 other nations," he said, "it is made impossible for the seamen who broke their contract to labor, while the vessel was in a safe harbor, to be taken by force from the State to State, arrested, detained and surrendered back to those to whom they owed service or labor. This was done 50 years after the fugitive slave law had been abolished in the United States. Is this class legislation?

"American vessels doing about 8 per cent of the world's carrying trade had a yearly average of 37 cases of scurvy and berri-berri for more than 20 years prior to the passage of the seamen's act. England, doing 67½ per cent of the world's carrying trade, had a yearly average of 60 cases of scurvy and berri-berri. The new English scale of provisions was adopted in 1906. The American scale for American vessels was adopted in 1898, and was amended and completed in 1915 in the seamen's act. Scurvy and berri-berri have disappeared from under those flags since the passage of those laws. Is that class legislation?

"The American ship was known as the 'blood tub of the ocean.' There was more brutality, more maiming, more killing and wounding in the 8 per cent of the world's carrying trade, controlled by America, than in the 67½ per cent controlled by England. Was the abolition of that condition in American vessels class legislation?

"American ships were permitted to go to sea with men, none of whom, exclusive of licensed officers, had ever been to sea before. The seamen's act, in the interest of the traveling public, took the provisions of foreign nations as to skill and made them applicable to American vessels and all other vessels leaving ports of the United States. Is this class legislation?

"The seaman, naturally, had to be fed, but he was compelled to carry his own mess gear—spoon, knife, fork, plate and drinking cup. Under the new law these are furnished. They are furnished to everyone else, prisoners included. The seaman was the last to get them. Is this class legislation?

"The La Follette act provides for safety to the traveling public on American vessels leaving the United States and made the same laws applicable to foreign vessels leaving the United States. Is this class legislation?

"The ship owners have disregarded every phase of the seamen's act until compelled by the courts to obey. This only applies to those parts of the act where the seamen themselves have an opportunity to go to the courts for redress. In this the ship owners have been aided and abetted by the government departments and by the Shipping Board."

FAULTY MANAGEMENT IN TEXTILE INDUSTRY

New York, Feb. 5.—"I know of no textile mill management that kept its machinery up to date, with practical men directing it, that has been forced to go out of business because of labor laws," says Thomas F. McMahon, president of the United Textile Workers, writing in the Textile Worker.

"Many mill buildings are obsolete because of structural arrangement. Directors of these ancient factories decided, in many instances, it would be uneconomical to install new machinery. Offers of tax exemption and cheap labor from other parts of the country have been frequent.

"After establishing a paying business, cotton manufacturers take the profits secured through Northern workmanship and skill and place it in the same business in another locality because they can exploit women and children. Many mills in New England prosper under the 48-hour week. Most of these factories have splendid working and sanitary conditions, and, best of all, splendid co-operation between management and workers.

"There will be no permanent progress in the textile industry until unfair manufacturers recognize that employes are human beings.

"If these reactionary employers would give as serious thought to improvement in their mills under present day conditions as they do to plotting and planning how to secure political power and the return of the long work day, conditions would not be as they are."

COAL RATE INQUIRY DEMANDED BY MINERS

Indianapolis, Feb. 5.—The United Mine Workers' convention favored an inquiry of freight rates that the Interstate Commerce Commission has granted to the non-union fields of Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky and Tennessee.

Coal from these fields is shipped through the union coal fields of Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois to the great coal-consuming markets at a lower freight cost than the union coal, thus giving the non-union fields more to the consumer, who does not gain by the preferential rates.

"On the other hand, the competing mines in Kentucky, Virginia, West Virginia and Tennessee, as a result of special favors, have increased their production, opened new mines and thus added to the already demoralized condition of the industry."

The commission defends its preferential rates on the ground that the competition of the non-union States cut off their legitimate markets and brought them to a condition of bankruptcy.

"In the first place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the second place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the third place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fourth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fifth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the sixth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the seventh place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the eighth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the ninth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the tenth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the eleventh place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the twelfth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the thirteenth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fourteenth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fifteenth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the sixteenth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the seventeenth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the eighteenth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the nineteenth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the twentieth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the twenty-first place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the twenty-second place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the twenty-third place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the twenty-fourth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the twenty-fifth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the twenty-sixth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the twenty-seventh place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the twenty-eighth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the twenty-ninth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the thirtieth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the thirty-first place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the thirty-second place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the thirty-third place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the thirty-fourth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the thirty-fifth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the thirty-sixth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the thirty-seventh place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the thirty-eighth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the thirty-ninth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fortieth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the forty-first place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the forty-second place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the forty-third place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the forty-fourth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the forty-fifth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the forty-sixth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the forty-seventh place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the forty-eighth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the forty-ninth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fiftieth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fifty-first place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fifty-second place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fifty-third place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fifty-fourth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fifty-fifth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fifty-sixth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fifty-seventh place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fifty-eighth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the fifty-ninth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the sixtieth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the sixty-first place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the sixty-second place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the sixty-third place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the sixty-fourth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the sixty-fifth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the sixty-sixth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the sixty-seventh place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the sixty-eighth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the sixty-ninth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the seventieth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the seventy-first place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the seventy-second place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the seventy-third place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the seventy-fourth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the seventy-fifth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the seventy-sixth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the seventy-seventh place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the seventy-eighth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the seventy-ninth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the eightieth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the eighty-first place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the eighty-second place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the eighty-third place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the eighty-fourth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the eighty-fifth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the eighty-sixth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the eighty-seventh place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the eighty-eighth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the eighty-ninth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the ninetieth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the ninety-first place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the ninety-second place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the ninety-third place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the ninety-fourth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the ninety-fifth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the ninety-sixth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the ninety-seventh place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the ninety-eighth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the ninety-ninth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes. In the one hundredth place, the competing mines are located in States which refuse to enact laws to protect the workers in the exercise of their right to organize, and in which the employers refuse to recognize the United Mine Workers of America as the bargaining agency of their employes.

America Has Imperialistic Ideal; War Possible, Wheeler Predicts

New York, Feb. 5.—"We are hell-bent on the meanest kind of an imperialistic policy in the Latin American countries," said Senator Wheeler of Montana at a non-intervention mass meeting in this city.

The speaker predicted that after Congress adjourned next month war with Mexico will follow the killing of an American citizen or some other incident.

After describing American criticism of British imperialism in Africa and Asia, Senator Wheeler said:

"What hypocrisy—yes, what cowards you are in the face of your pretensions of your statesmen and near-statesmen when you let your own Government permit a few capitalists in your fair city of New York to take away the sovereignty of a free people in Nicaragua, in Haiti, in Santo Domingo, in Mexico or any other country.

"Are we going to build up and keep at great expense a huge army and a huge navy to protect all our nationals that seek to exploit the people of weaker nations who must come to us for money to develop their countries? Are we going to loan the money and then send American boys to collect the money? Are we going to let our nationals obtain concessions or titles through bribery and corruption from weak and illiterate people and then send our citizen boys to uphold them in their immoral, if not criminal, acts?

"Are we going to intrigue or let our nationals intrigue for the overthrow of government we don't like and whose code of ethics, we say, are not as high as those of Daugherty and Fall and Doheny?"

Senator Wheeler declared that "wholesale graft has characterized the Banker-State Department control of Nicaragua for the past 17 years."

"The State Department has literally gutted the sovereignty of Nicaragua. At this moment it has the little puppet hog-tied. Its sovereignty is a ghastly mockery," he said.

EVIDENCE CONCEALED TO CONVICT TWO MEN

Boston, Feb. 5.—Suppressed evidence that "would have wrecked the State's case," was presented to the State Supreme